UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/674,965	09/30/2003	David Bruce Kumhyr	AUS920030728US1	4947

35525 7590 11/14/2007

IBM CORP (YA)
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER	
PARK, GEORGE M	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
4114	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/14/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/674,965	KUMHYR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	George Park	4114	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE *3* MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *30 September 2003* is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☒ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *9/30/2003*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: "Display 500" (page 17, line 2) is not shown in the drawings. Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

In addition to Replacement Sheets containing the corrected drawing figure(s), applicant is required to submit a marked-up copy of each Replacement Sheet including annotations indicating the changes made to the previous version. The marked-up copy must be clearly labeled as "Annotated Sheets" and must be presented in the amendment or remarks section that explains the change(s) to the drawings. See 37 CFR 1.121(d)(1). Failure to timely submit the proposed drawing and marked-up copy will result in the abandonment of the application.

Specification

2. The use of the trademark "IBM" (page 8, line 17), "Advanced Interactive Executive" (page 8, line 19), "LINUX" (page 8, line 20), "Windows XP" (page 9, line 23) and "Java" (page

9, lines 25 and 27) has been noted in this application. It should be capitalized wherever it appears and be accompanied by the generic terminology.

Although the use of trademarks is permissible in patent applications, the proprietary nature of the marks should be respected and every effort made to prevent their use in any manner which might adversely affect their validity as trademarks.

Claim Objections

3. Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: The term "at" (line 8) should be recited as --a--. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

5. Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being unpatentable by Bingham et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0069094 A1).

Regarding to claim 22, Bingham et al. discloses a data processing system (see fig. 2a, paragraph [0021], lines 1-6) comprising: a bus system (see fig. 2b, paragraph [0022], lines 3-10); a memory connected to the bus system (see fig. 2b, paragraph [0022], lines 3-17), wherein the memory includes a set of instructions (paragraph [0022], lines 10-14); and a processing unit (i.e. processor) connected to the bus system (see fig. 2b, paragraph [0022], lines 3-10), wherein the

processing unit executes the set of instructions (paragraph [0022], lines 10-14) to provide a database of meeting room resources (i.e. meeting package) (paragraph [0018], lines 3-9), wherein the database includes attributes describing physical characteristics (i.e. meeting site requirements/criteria) of each meeting room in the meeting room resources (paragraph [0004], lines 11-15, paragraph [0020], lines 7-9); receive a request for a meeting room, wherein the request includes at set of attributes (paragraph [0029], lines 10-12); determine (i.e. define) whether the meeting room meeting the set of attributes is available (paragraph [0029], lines 12-15 and 18-20); allocate the meeting room to a user in response to a determination that the meeting room is available (paragraph [0029], lines 28-31); and present a set of reserved meeting room resources in response to a determination that the meeting room meeting the set of attributes is unavailable (paragraph [0033], lines 18-25).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

8. Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 11, 15, 16 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bingham et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0069094 A1).

Regarding to claims 1, 8 and 15, Bingham et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Bingham et al. discloses a method, data processing system, and computer program product in a computer readable medium (i.e. disk) for allocating meeting room resources (paragraph [0008], lines 1-2, paragraph [0017], lines 1-2, paragraph [0021], lines 10-13, paragraph [0025], lines 1-6), the method, data processing system and computer program product in a computer readable medium comprising: providing means for providing a database of meeting room resources (paragraph [0017], lines 1-2, paragraph [0018], lines 3-9), wherein the database includes attributes describing physical characteristics of each meeting room (i.e. meeting facility criteria) in the meeting room resources (paragraph [0020], lines 7-9); receiving means for receiving a request for a meeting room, wherein the request includes a set of attributes

(i.e. meeting facility criteria)(paragraph [0029], lines 10-12); determining means for determining (i.e. defining) whether the meeting room meeting the set of attributes is available (paragraph [0029], lines 12-15 and 18-20); allocating means, responsive to a determination that the meeting room is available, for allocating the meeting room to a user (paragraph [0029], lines 28-31); presenting means, responsive to a determination that the meeting room meeting the set of attributes is unavailable, for presenting a set of reserved meeting room resources (paragraph [0033], lines 18-25). However, Bingham et al. does not explicitly disclose first, second, third, fourth and fifth instructions (as per claim 15). It is common knowledge in the prior art to have a set of instructions in a computer program product. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the computer program product in a computer readable medium taught by Bingham et al. with the feature of having first, second, third, fourth and fifth instructions (as per claim 15). The motivation for doing so would have been to execute instructions in the computer program product in sequential order.

Regarding to claims 2, 9 and 16, Bingham et al. discloses wherein the attributes (i.e. criteria) include a room (i.e. facility) capacity and a location (i.e. geographic preference) (paragraph [0004], lines 15-19, paragraph [0034], lines 9-14, paragraph [0039], lines 26-31).

Regarding to claims 4, 11 and 18, Bingham et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Bingham et al. discloses wherein the presenting step comprises: sending the set of reserved meeting room resources to a client (i.e. computer), wherein the set of reserved meeting room resources are displayed to a user at the client (paragraph [0033], lines 18-25). However, Bingham et al. does not explicitly disclose sub-instructions (as per claim 15). It is common

knowledge in the prior art to have a set of sub-instructions in a computer program product. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the computer program product in a computer readable medium taught by Bingham et al. with the feature of sub-instructions. The motivation for doing so would have been to execute sub-instructions within instructions of the computer product.

9. Claims 3, 10 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bingham et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0069094 A1) as applied to claims 1, 8 and 15 above, and further in view of Ralston et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2003/0005055 A1).

Regarding to claims 3, 10 and 17 Bingham et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Bingham et al. does not explicitly disclose wherein the attributes include a white board, a conference phone, wired network connections, wireless network connections, an overhead projector, and a podium. Ralston et al. teaches attributes (i.e. services) to include room requirements, facility capability stipulations and equipments (paragraph [0028], lines 1-5, paragraph [0031], lines 18-20, paragraph [0037], lines 20-25). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method, data processing system, and computer program product in a computer readable medium of Bingham et al. wherein the attributes a white board, a conference phone, wired network connections, wireless network connections, an overhead projector, and a podium as taught by Ralston et al. as both Bingham et al. and Ralston et al. are directed to the method, data processing system, and computer program product in a computer readable medium for allocating

meeting room resources. The motivation for doing so would have been to meet desired attributes to those reserving the meeting room.

10. Claims 5, 12 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bingham et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0069094 A1), and further in view of Vossler (U.S. Pat. No. 6,614,450 B1).

Regarding to claims 5, 12 and 19, Bingham et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Bingham et al. does not disclose wherein the presenting means is a first presenting means (as per claim 12) and sub-instructions (as per claim 19) further comprising: second presenting means (as per claim 12) and sub-instructions (as per claim 19) responsive to a selection of a reserved meeting room from the set of reserved meeting room resources, presenting contact information for a reserving party of the reserved meeting room (as per claims 5, 12 and 19). Vossler teaches displaying information regarding room usage (column 5, lines 24-30, lines 47-50, column 6, lines 15-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method, data processing system, and computer program product in a computer readable medium of Bingham et al. wherein the presenting means is a first presenting means and sub-instructions further comprising: second presenting means and sub-instructions responsive to a selection of a reserved meeting room from the set of reserved meeting room resources, presenting contact information for a reserving party of the reserved meeting room as taught by Vossler, as both Bingham et al. and Vossler are directed to the method, data processing system, and computer program product

in a computer readable medium for allocating meeting room resources. The motivation for doing so would have been to be able to contact the person or group reserving the room if needed.

11. Claims 6, 7, 13, 14, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bingham et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0069094 A1), and further in view of Okawa (U.S. Pat. No. 5,933,810).

Regarding to claims 6, 13 and 20, Bingham et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Bingham et al. does not disclose wherein the determining means is a first determining means and wherein the allocating means is the first allocating means (as per claim 13) further comprising second determining means (as per claim 13) and sixth instructions (as per claim 20) responsive to a selection of a reserved meeting room from the set of reserved meeting room resources by a user, determining whether the user has priority over a reserving party of the reserved meeting room; and second allocating means (as per claims 6 and 13) and seventh instructions (as per claim 20) responsive to the user having priority over the reserving party, allocating the reserved meeting room the user. Okawa teaches assigning and determining a priority for users making reservations (column 1, lines 14-18, lines 34-39, lines 47-51, column 2, lines 65-67, column 5, lines 14-17) and replacing the reservation to the user having higher priority (i.e. degree of importance) (column 9, lines 35-43, column 10, lines 17-19). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method, data processing system, and computer program product in a computer readable medium of Bingham et al. wherein the determining means is a first determining means and wherein the allocating means is the first allocating means further

comprising second determining means and sixth instructions responsive to a selection of a reserved meeting room from the set of reserved meeting room resources by a user, determining whether the user has priority over a reserving party of the reserved meeting room; and second allocating means and seventh instructions responsive to the user having priority over the reserving party, allocating the reserved meeting room the user taught by Okawa as both Bingham et al. and Okawa are directed to the method, data processing system, and computer program product in a computer readable medium for allocating meeting room resources. The motivation for doing so would have been to allocate a reserved meeting room to a user having higher priority.

Regarding to claims 7, 14 and 21, Bingham et al. discloses the invention substantially as claimed. However, Bingham et al. does not disclose eighth instructions (as per claim 21) responsive to an allocation of the reserved meeting room to the user, sending the reserving party a notification of the allocation (as per claims 7, 14 and 21) . Okawa teaches sending a notification (i.e. electronic mail) informing the person who made the reservation and others (column 9, lines 56-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the method, data processing system, and computer program product in a computer readable medium of Bingham et al. with the feature of eighth instructions responsive to an allocation of the reserved meeting room to the user, sending the reserving party a notification of the allocation taught by Okawa, as both Bingham et al. and Okawa are directed to the method, data processing system, and computer program product in a computer readable medium for allocating meeting room resources. The motivation for doing so would be to notify the reserving party of the reservation.

Conclusion

12. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Bingham et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,324,517 B1) teaches facilities evaluated based on an all-inclusive meeting cost. Breitenbach et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0016729 A1) teaches a system and method to schedule an event. Chan et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2004/0260659 A1) teaches a system and method to provide an availability and price determination for function space.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George Park whose telephone number is (571) 270-3547. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joe Cheng can be reached on (571) 272-4433. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

GP
11/01/07

/Joe H Cheng/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4114